

COMMENTS-ATTENDEE'S POLL
PROPOSAL # 1 – CROSSING AG LAND
PROPOSAL # 2 - LOT SIZE

RESIDENT LANDOWNERS

Proposal # 1 - I actually don't see any harm with driveways going across ag land. I wish it was clear what this would really mean in terms of how it would affect development. There sure were a lot of vague unsupported statements made.

Use common sense

A lot of farmers are depending on their land for their retirement. Stop denying this from happening!!!!

Changes are too vague. Need a lot more work before being considered further.

Just follow the current LUP as written!

I feel we need to protect our property rights

Need more work on proposal

Keep up the good work Dale!

It's the right thing to do for the township and all of its residents (yes vote on both proposals)

I think we need to come together. Maybe we need some clarification or adjustment.

Proposal # 1 needs much more work

Do not change plan unless you make it stricter. Increase density to 1 per 100. Have siting criteria. Count farmhouses.

Need specific restrictions spelled out.

Proposal 1 amendment as written is too nebulous. Need to be more specific.

We need to clarify the language of the driveway proposal.

Please consider land trust as an alternative to development. That is where the \$\$\$'s are. Is there anyone to help Steve and Florence resolve their need for cash flow to help them find a solution that is better than developing their land. This would resolve a lot for the town. There are many misconceptions of how land trusts can or can't work. What are their other options...Can they sell the land they want to sell to a trust?

Farmers need to have rights for value of their property. Compromise needs to be by both sides and not only one.

There is always room for compromise! Let's ALL do it!!

Changes can be made to the current land use plan.

Proposal # 1 – not as written – needs more definition.

Proposal # 1 – needs more work

Okay with # 1 “only if” guarantees are defined for concept plan, siting criteria, conservation easements (generational), growth caps, and restricted development.

Proposal # 1 – It's a great start. Just needs a little fine-tuning. Important that it be wrapped up soon and we move forward.

Proposal # 1 – I agree with Jonathan Barry that more work needs to be done. Cannot accept the proposal – too vague.

We should conduct business to be considerate of individual needs. It can be done without compromising agriculture. Large realty developers have many ways of stalling – however, they can pay a farmer what his land is worth and then sit on it.

If we make the land use plan too complicated, it will be hard to administer.

Proposal # 1 – we need to be fair to a farmer that didn't have access to build as some that did.

The land use plan is already good if used as written, but we are for the amendment if need be for fairness.

Proposal # 1 – Leave good enough alone

The desire to compromise has been stated but is not reality.

Need to have a definition as to “prime land” – difference also - if it is a road or a driveway. More clarification is needed.

This great nation was built on freedom!! We should have freedom to use our land as we want – we worked hard to own it!!

Thank you Florence and Steve for your sincerity – I hear your needs. I think you should get a build with some changes – leave out “roads” in your proposal, also “rime” in prime

agricultural land. What's good for one family may not be good for another and all our values count so you are right, we ALL have to compromise.

Why don't you use the land use plan as written than you won't have to change anything and Steve can get his build.

Existing language in LUP covering this issue is adequate i.e. committee can exercise discretion.

Make 1 per 70

Farming and the agriculture industry is the economic soul of our township. Since the township – board and commission – have not helped the farms, we need this vote to keep our farmers in business.

Need to refine the driveway ordinance later.

Get some common sense and feeling for the farmers that have built this township.

Without “trusts” no slippery slope toward development. 4 acres is far better for water table than 2 acres.

This meeting was more civil than most. That was appreciated.

Proposal # 1 is too open-ended. Concept is good but it needs work.

NON-RESIDENT LANDOWNERS

5 years of rehashing the same subject gets us nowhere – it's like a soap opera – tune in years later and nothing has changed.

Proposal # 1 – can use some more work

Proposal # 1 – maybe clarify crossing, but that's where – what ifs can make proposals to restrictive.

Proposal # 1 – add definition

There are too many loopholes in proposal # 1. It does not adequately address what is “close to”, what is “prime”, what is “least impact”. This needs to be part of a larger plan that includes some of the issues brought up by Jonathan Barry and Ron Rassner. I appreciate the work of Florence and Steve.